MINUTES OF DECEMBER 7, 1972

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

Board of Directors:	Mike Phillips, President Dick Raymond Jerry Mander Stewart Brand Huey Johnson
Elijah:	Jo Ann Silverstein, Pacific Change
Staff Coordinator:	Dick Austin
Recorder of Minutes:	Beth Sosnick

The December 7th Board of Directors Meeting was held at Green Gulch, Marin - The Zen Center.

New Office:

The new office is located on the roof of Glide Church, 330 Ellis Street, San Francisco, 928-8469, for $35 per month, until the Post Office Box comes through.

The new staff coordinator, Dick Austin, is currently working on (1) Arranging the February gathering (investigating costs, etc.); and (2) Point's First Annual Publication.

Point's February Gathering:

The group agreed on having a trip in February. Jerry feels that the goal of the gathering should be to get agents and board members together to exchange ideas and draw energy from each other as well as decide whether they want the responsibility of being a "family". It is suggest by Stewart that Point has been sitting on a stew for a long time and now will be stirring it; hence, doesn't a hot springs seem appropriate? Esalen and Tasa Hara are discussed. Huey and Mike want Alta, Utah. The board decided on a nearer location. It is decided (after the meeting) that the trip will be a three day jaunt to Foresta Institute. Foresta is in the mountains and also near hot springs. Stewart also feels that a bus trip would lend a certain magic (everyone being so close together for a five hour interval). A bus will be rented for the occasion. The happening will occur during the first week in February. It is decided to arrange an appropriate method of allocating funds for

the trip ($50 for those near Bay Area, $100 - right out of state, $200 east coast, and so on). If the agents want to reserve time to inform people of their project, possibly set up schedule and have them apply for a set interval of time (several two hour segments, for example).

Point's First Annual Publication:

The importance of the publication is agreed upon, not only for general information, but also for grantees, for government, for anyone interest in attaining capital for a project, for public information, and possibl Point could make it available reading before allowing interviews.

It is agreed that certain studies should be somewhat camouflaged in order to protect people involved: (1) One agent who is working on a community murder problem would be put in a position too vulnerable if it was known what he is doing; (2) In other cases there might be intimate political problems where a liable might be involved. Everyone has expressed a desire to personally edit manuscript before the final publication, although complete "open-disclosure" is decided as a good policy.

Also all board members are going to review all the minutes of previous board meetings.

Dick reports that 400 copies will cost about $1500. It is agreed that Point should charge cost only and that additional copies will be available for board members, friends, contacts, etc.

Point's Philosophy

Everyone on the board has been interviewed except Mike who states that he does not wish to give interviews, that what he has accomplished in th past should speak for itself.

Is Point prepared to be a community/family? Many people apparently ha a great sense of pride in belonging to Point. Should Point resist the dependency or officially accept "familydom". Jerry and Mike feel the February gathering will be the last time Point will be able to relate with a sense of small and close community. Apparently Stewart and Richard have had extremely bad results with people, relating to the family/dependency trip. It is agreed that all grants are for one year and not renewable.

It is mentioned that Chick (Ecotopia) has offered to write a document on how Point can direct itself toward a "steady state system". What can Point do to work on a common board project? It is important to maintain a very receptive attitude about new proposals - not only continuing to do what Point is good at, but also spend time, as Jerry suggests, thinking of politics in a broad sense. Richard feels one of the most important things he is doing is working continuously with agents on already established projects.

Jerry and Jo Ann feel it is important to get better exposure. In order to break the isolation barrier, spend more time with different communities and foundations and get a good idea of how they work. Let more people know that this money is here, not just those who are in Point's general realm of contact.

Jerry wants someone who can create a group sense and knows about group process to get more out of the board meetings.

Minute Recorder's Addendum #1. (see last page)

New Board Member and Succession:

It is agreed that Point is heavily environmentally directed and that there is a need to aim Point toward more socially conscious projects as well. Mike is adamant about the importance of maintaining a world perspective. Pierre Morno (sp?), Virginia Baker, and Willy Williot (sp are suggested. Pros and cons of each are reviewed. He also suggests that the next time the board meets they get involved in a totally actio oriented, non-verbal manner (chopping wood), perhaps with the hope of giving direction.

Jerry wants to expand the board to nine members. Should there be a four person board? A four person board and Elijah? Two more board members with Elijah?

As per discussion on philosophy, Richard does not want there to be a "philosophy". He feels that to have a set philosophy is totalitarian in nature and that he would like it to simply be an exchange of information. The board agreed that Mike was to meet each member individuall to discuss how to improve the board meetings

Jo Ann and Jerry have suggested that a group relationship should be established between Point and Pacific Change. Stewart believes that variant parallel systems are important and Mike feels that they are two different experiences that should be kept separate. Problem: does a six person entity (Pacific Change) become a second class citizen? Can a rotating six person entity maintain a standard philosophy? Jo Ann feels you cannot dictate what a person should say at a board meeting - it is important to maintain the freedom of individuality. However, Jerry feels it is important to have community process vs. individual process.

Stewart suggests drawing straws for the new board member. Whoever picked the short straw would select the new board member. However, there has been no conclusion drawn on the succession issue.

Addendum #2.

Pacific Change:

See Jo Ann Silverstein's letter from Pacific Change, December, 1972.

Pacific Change's philosophy in connection with the family/dependency problem is that they try to be as clear and honest as possible (about the fact that it is only a grant for a certain interval of time, not a permanent Medici*). Pacific Change has occasional parties for the grantees and grantors to get together. She says they never use the word family - it is a loaded word. Furthermore, if you're honest and clear about where you stand initially, you won't have to place yourself in a position where you must "kick people around".

Jo Ann feels there is much for both sides (relationship between Point and Pacific Change) to benefit from in an inter-locking directory type relationship that has a sense of vulnerability/responsibility to both parties. A contract creates distance and avoids the advantages of a more susceptible contact.

A rotating six person entity from Pacific Change as an alternative to one person is discussed. Even though the primary advantage for Pacific Change would be financial, Point would gain the *priceless* advantage of having real grass roots contact and better opportunity for genuine social change projects. (what good is a"blue sky"project when most of the populace can't get off the ground?) Pacific Change, as Jo Ann point out would be a conduit into the community for Point with symbiotic feedback. Therefore, to have a constant on-going relationship with a settled, actively working foundation would be effectively beneficial in initiating growth and development for Point and might fill in the "gap" caused by Point's isolation.

Elijah Position:

The effect that other Elijahs had on Board meetings was related. However, no terms were deduced as to what the board really expects from the Elijah.

Addendum #3.

*Relates to the Medici family of Renaissance Florence who donated to the arts and supported artists.

Other Matters Discussed:

During lunch Jo Ann asked the board how they felt about money on an individual basis. Mike and Jerry expressed guilt. Jerry suggested a model (a shipful of corn) that would be a way of dealing with guilt on the most direct possible level.

Huey arrived after lunch. Mike and Richard voted Huey off the board, however, all were happy to see Huey upon his arrival.

Richard Raymond's November 21, Board Memorandum: Richard gave a clear summarization: of his suggestions for giving Point direction both in general policy and in the meetings; listed his grants, summarized and evaluated them; related his impressions and feelings of what he expects of himself as a director.

It is agreed that no more funds shall be distributed to Bill English since his grant was completed October 31. However, all members have expressed interest in working with Bill on his dyna-book.

The pursuance of other legal suits (such as the Bank of America suit) is discussed. Huey feels: (1) that getting involved in more suits would mean a great deal of administrative work for Point, and (2) that you never know when you might need the person you are suing as an ally. Mike states: (1) that foundations, universities, etc., are sitting on many billions of dollars (power) and not using it and that examples are needed; (2) for the current law suit there is no administrative cost and very little time spent, and (3) he agrees with Huey in that the legal process takes too many years. The result of the conversation is that Point will continue to pursue proxy battles.

Huey tells of farm lands that are available to non-profit organizations and could be donated to Trust for Public Land or Point. Point should definitely get communes or groups of interested counter-culture people together and investigate. This would be a great opportunity to aid lower/working class people. They might be more interested in being self-sufficient than a "commune."

A VERY PEACEFUL AND CREATIVE NEW YEAR TO ALL OF YOU !!!

Minute Recorder's Addenda:

#1 It would seem imperative at this point to define both individually and collectively how you want to disperse the capital. It's more than the dilemma of questioning the worth and effectiveness of sending a ship of corn to the hungriest people in the world. The impression given at the meeting is that the directors wait for people with far-out sounding ideas to come to them for money. Is it possible to expect a reputation as an invovative, experimental foundation without accepting responsibility to and for it? Possibly the board members could resolve (in writing) what the responsibilities of a director of Point really are ... Is it possible to be a director and not be open to receiving proposals for grants? Can a board member really lend direction to Point's growth on an irregular basis? (are you missing something vital without having the constant, educational relationship of a few hours a day together as an example?) How much effectiveness is Point losing by functioning on a discretionary fund basis only? Can a board member receive pay for time invested in Point activities? If Point is not will to "get together" with Pacific Change, how do you propose to fill the gap created by having a purely homogeneous group: no third world, no feminist and no working class affiliations?

A group can decide what their basic principles, goals and image are and still maintain a great deal of flexibility. At least enough to avoid such confusion. Point's "philosophy" might not have to be a permanent issue if the Board of Directors would honestly establish what they want from each other and Point early in the game. It is my observation that it is easy to hide behind the mask of "looseness" in order to avoid confrontation with each other on important issues. Perhaps the reality of controlling so much liquid power and the responsibility that goes with it is still too overwhelming.

#2 To possibly provide a sense of order, perhaps Point should (1) appoint someone, maybe a non-board member, to be a regular moderator during board meetings. This person could be responsible for establishing the agenda, maintaining productivity by keeping the conversations from straying, and summarize the position of each topic before venturing into other areas. This doesn't have to be as formal as it sounds, but lack of order and an acknowledged policy (or common premise, or whatever) causes chaos; (2) a joint-Point answering service which is now being investigated, would certainly lend a feeling of really being there; (3) Having someone to do correspondence, telephone work, etc., (a computerized secretary has been suggested by Stewart) At any rate, this person would give semblance of organization and (4) would be a good person for Point's recorder of minutes for the regular board meetings because of the familiarity she/he would have developed with everyone's trips and would also be in a position to contribute to the meetings (this would also eliminate the need for a tape recorder, as there was an objection from Huey about it).

#3 The board seems to want the Elijah to contribute freely a certain amount of energy (like a blood transfusion), but is not willi to allow the Elijah any power. That's a lot of responsibility to expect particularly from someone who might not be intimate with the group, both individually and collectively.